UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,423	03/12/2004	David Ray Burritt	403118-A-01-US (Burritt)	7122

47523 7590 04/23/2007
JOHN C. MORAN, ATTORNEY, P.C.
4120 EAST 115 PLACE
THORNTON, CO 80233-2623

EXAMINER	
WOODS, ERIC V	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2628	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/799,423	BURRITT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eric Woods	2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 February 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-14 and 16-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-14 and 16-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pages 18-29 and claim amendments, filed 1/23/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-36 under various statutes have been fully considered and are partially persuasive.

Claims 1, 15, and 29-36 have been canceled; therefore, all grounds of rejection against them stand withdrawn as moot.

Claims 2-14 and 16-28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over various combinations of references stand withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments to the claims.

Examiner notes that dependent claims and specific elements within independent claims cannot have an effective filing date (EFD) derived from a priority claim (e.g. CIP status) for purposes of determining the filing date with respect to the prior art that is earlier than that of the independent claim(s) themselves or from which the aforementioned dependent claims derive. Therefore, as applicant has admitted on page 20 of Remarks, all claims receive the EFD of the instant application, since the (admitted) inventive element is not present in the priority application.

The objections to the specification stand withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments.

The objections to the drawings stand withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments to the specification describing the elements in the drawings that previously had no corresponding element or identification in the written description.

Upon further consideration, examiner finds that the material added to the specification to provide for support to claim 6 does not constitute new matter. Said amendment is accepted, since it adds a *per se* copy of claim 6 to the specification, and the corresponding objection to the specification as lacking antecedent basis per MPEP 608.01(o) stands withdrawn.

It is further noted that the preamble of independent claims 2, 8, 16, and 22 is not relevant because a preamble is not given patentable weight when it only recites a summary of the claim and/or an intended use, and the process steps and/or apparatus components are capable of standing on their own; see Rowe v. Dror, 112 F.3d 473, 42 USPQ2d 1550 (Fed. Cir. 1997), Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 182 F.3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165 (Fed. Cir. 1999), and the like. Specifically, these preambles recite only an intended use of aforementioned telecommunication terminal and are not relevant to prosecution.

The rejection of claims 2-7 and 16-21, in their original form, do stand withdrawn, but they are significantly deficient for at least the reasons set forth below.

Firstly, Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-7 and 16-21 fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. That is, applicant's one sentence response is quoted from page 22: "At the very least, Forlenza and Schnarel do not singularly or in combination disclose the steps of establishing and accessing as recited in amended claim 2."

With respect to claims 4-7 and 18-21, as noted above, preambles are not given patentable weight, at least whatever portion is directed to an intended use, such as generating information "for a certain class of people" as in the instant case.

With respect to the arguments direct at claims 8-14 and 22-28, the arguments are *not* persuasive since Forlenza does in fact teach the argued limitation, but there are other elements therein that are not expressly taught (e.g. the direct connection to the switch by the client and/or the direct connection to the telecommunications terminal, in both cases by the computer).

Below is this pointed out.

The rest of the arguments directed to the patentability of claims 8-14 and 22-28 (e.g. latter paragraph on page 24, ending on first two lines of page 25) only serve to extol the virtues of applicant's system. They only serve as a general allegation of patentability with respect to the criticality element.

Firstly, quoting from Forlenza, Abstract and 1:57-59, "Public switches and public branch exchanges may also be modified to generate and deliver call status codes or messages. Thusly, a **caller** may view call status information on a computer screen while attempting a telephone call." This would *prima facie* argue against applicant's point that there exists no teaching that "discloses or suggests that client 138 directly accesses the call status information from the public switch." See Forlenza (12:52-13:7), in the context of an example:

(61) Thus, the present invention solves the disadvantages of the prior art by providing a telephone device with a customized display for displaying call connection status information. The telephone device detects call status events, such as ringing and busy signals, and presents the call status via the display. The telephone device also receives codes indicating particular call

status events, such as "on hold" and "voice mail record mode." The present invention also provides telephones and other devices, such as answering machines and interactive voice response systems that generate call status codes or messages.

(62) A telephone device may generate a code, which indicates that the user is hearing impaired. Thus, devices receiving this code may perform particular functions in response to such a code. For example, if an answering machine receives a code indicating that the caller is hearing impaired, the answering machine may skip the message, transmit a "recording" call status code, and record the caller's message. Public switches and public branch exchanges may also be modified to generate and deliver call status codes or messages. The present invention may also deliver call status information through another medium, such as a network. Thus, a caller may view call status information on a computer screen while attempting a telephone call.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Forlenza **clearly** suggests in one embodiment that the "public switch network" or in the alternate, a PBX, may deliver the status codes.

However, as pointed out above, the rejections of claims 8-14 and 22-28 under 35 USC 103(a) stand withdrawn in view of applicant's added limitations.

Applicant did not challenge and/or properly traverse examiner's taking of Official notice in the last Office Action with respect to claims 13 and 27 concerning the use of sockets in TCP/IP systems. See MPEP 2144.03(C). Therefore, such statement is now Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and is a matter of record.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/12/2007 was filed after the mailing date of the First Action On the Merits on 10/24/2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> **Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.**

Claims 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they recite non-statutory subject matter. First of all, there is no structure disclosed.

Specifically, claims 16 and 22 fail to comply with the Interim Guidelines for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility; specifically they recite a computer program per se (see pages 30 and 51-56). In order for a computer program to be properly claimed, it must be claimed as a manufacture, that is, a **physical**, **tangible** item that is **functionally interrelated** with a computer program via the program being encoded upon said item, wherein the physical, tangible item needs to be computer-readable. Thusly, "A ... processor-readable medium for... comprising processor-readable instructions configured for: " fails to properly invoke the required functional interrelationship between medium and program. See MPEP 2105-2106 and Interim Guidelines Annexes (ii) and (iv)(pages 52-55). The item that should be claimed is **not** the program per se; rather it is a physical computer readable medium that is encoded with a computer program that causes a computer to perform some task. Therefore, the proper order of those elements (computer readable medium and program) in the claim should be of the form recited above for the claims to be held as statutory. As written, the claims are now directed to a computer program per se, which is not within the four statutory categories of patent-eligible subject matter. Claims 16 and 22 are shown to be software via the specification (14:14-20).

That is to say, the "processor-readable medium" must have the computer program functionally interrelated, e.g. encoded, upon it. In the instant case, there is no recited relationship between the medium and the program and the medium therefore is a blank data storage element, which is *per se* not patentable.

Next, the claims recite "processor-readable." A processor is incapable of reading anything. It executes instructions; that is to say, there must be external interfaces, buses, et cetera that connect it to systems that can read the recited instructions. Therefore, that is impossibility. A computer is regarded as capable of doing so, but not a processor. Next, the method and computer-program product steps are identical. Therefore, each step described in the attempted claim for a processor-readable medium is therefore shown only to be instructions. See Annex II(A)(v) and Annex IV generally.

See Interim Guidelines for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility.

Therefore, all computer-readable medium claims are rejected as non-statutory.

All dependent claims 9-14 and 23-28 are therefore rejected as not correcting the deficiencies of their parent claim(s).

All claims rejected above under 35 USC 101 as non-statutory are further rejected below under the various other patent statutes in anticipation of applicant amending the claims to place them within one of the four statutory categories of subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> **(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the**

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-3, 8, 13-14, 16-17, 22, and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Forlenza et al (US 6,665,375) in view of Schnarel (US 6,975,712 B1) and Morgan (US 5,220,674 A). (FSM)

As to claims 2 and 15,

Forlenza teaches the following limitations:

A method for providing telecommunication terminal status information to people having at least one of poor visual acuity and poor hearing, comprising the steps of: (Preamble portion reciting intended use not given weight as above)

-Receiving telecommunication terminal status information by a telecommunication terminal via a network; (Forlenza Figure 1, telephones 108 attached to PBX 110 as an example, where this clearly provides digital information, and digital phones (e.g. 104) are also known – 2:40-3:6, where this includes status information 3:50-4:40, such as binary codes and the like, 7:10-25 where the system may deliver status codes directly to the client via the Internet and the like. Also, Figure 1 shows telephone 104, which clearly is attached to the public network, where this phone can receive some status

information (e.g. receiving phone call, terminal state, dial tone, etc). Finally, Forlenza clearly shows that IP phones are contemplated, e.g. 1:40-65, 7:25-40)

-Displaying the emphasized visual telecommunication terminal status information on the visual display. (Forlenza teaches that the call status information and the like are shown on a separate display, such as in Figure 2C such that the user can still have a normal phone and have the separate device which provides said information – 5:20-50, or client 138 as in Figure 1, explained in 6:45-7:35)

Forlenza partially teaches the following limitations:

-Emphasizing the accessed telecommunication terminal status information from telecommunications terminal by the computer via the network; (Forlenza teaches that such call status information is shown to the user and can be maximized and minimized and the like - 9:10-35)

-Establishing communication with the telecommunication terminal via the network by a computer controlling a visual display separate from the telecommunication terminal; (Forlenza Figure 1, client 138, 6:44-50, e.g. a PC or the like, and digital phones (e.g. 104) are also known – 2:40-3:6, where this includes status information 3:50-4:40, such as binary codes and the like, 7:10-25 where the system may deliver status codes directly to the client via the Internet and the like)

Forlenza fails to expressly teach emphasizing, whereas Schnarel teaches:

-Emphasizing the accessed telecommunication terminal status information from telecommunications terminal by the computer via the network; (Schnarel clearly displays enhanced visual information for connected calls and status information – see Figure 1 as call slip 100 in extended form that sits on top of the display (5:10-20), and Figure 5, where such enhanced or enlarged text is discussed as shown as extended call slip 500 / 504 in Figure (5:65-6:10), where such information is enhanced during a call, as well as icons concerning the status and the like, 7:35-8:40 and the like, especially including 11:50-60 – this is the most relevant portion)

Forlenza fails to expressly teach connecting to the telecommunications terminal by the computer via the network, whereas Morgan teaches:
-Establishing communication with the telecommunication terminal via the network by a computer controlling a visual display separate from the telecommunication terminal; (Morgan teaches forwarding status information information from device (Abstract, Title) printing system 17 to print clients (e.g. remote workstations 3:15-40) when there are messages generated by the printer concerning status or available resource.)
-Accessing the telecommunication terminal status information from telecommunication terminal by the computer via the network; (Morgan clearly teaches that external devices can connect to the printer and obtain status information, 3:15-40, 7:30-43, status queries are made by network clients, e.g. terminals / consoles / personal computers 20, printing clients 18a-18b, etc, and status message are returned, which is comparable to the recited 'accessing the telecommunication terminal status information.' Further, it is

clear that such components are on the same LAN (local area network), see Figure 1 and the various networked components)(Forlenza shows in Figure 1 that various devices can sit on the same IP network, and clearly the 7:10-45 suggests that the two IP devices sit on the same network and thusly avoid the need for the server. such an arrangement because this would result in efficiencies of operation, where a digital network allows bypassing of unnecessary status translation (Forlenza 7:25-40))

Forlenza teaches some of the limitations of the instant application, but fails to teach that such visual information is emphasized. Schnarel clearly teaches that limitation, as described above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Forlenza to emphasize such information as per Schnarel 2:30-50.

Finally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that since the central system of Forlenza directly provides status information to the telephones from the external switches (12:52-13:7, 1:37-39, Abstract), it would be redundant to send such information to both the telecommunication terminal and the computer, especially since the devices are on the same local / wide area network and are accessible to each other, and are both in physical proximity to the same user in the scenario contemplated by Forlenza. Morgan provides an example of a local area system that receives status information and forwards such information to local client(s), as described above. It is clear that the status passing described above would be applicable to the digital VoIP telephone on the same network as the computer,

as described by Morgan and Forlenza. It would therefore have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art to directly forward the status messages to the local client, such that there would be no redundant data transmission over the network so that the computer could therefore display such information.

As to claims 3 and 17, Forlenza does not expressly teach these limitations, but Schnarel teaches them – see Tables 1 and 2 on column sets (7/8) and (9/10) respectively with an ALERT/FULL state shown, where these are clearly alerts as defined in the specification.

As to claims 8 and 22,

A method for providing telecommunication terminal status information to people having at least one of poor visual acuity and poor hearing, comprising the steps of: (Preamble portion reciting intended use not given weight as above)

-Establishing communication with a telecommunication terminal via the network by a computer controlling a visual display separate from the telecommunication terminal;

-Directly accessing the telecommunication terminal status information from the telecommunication switching system by the computer via a path distinct from that used to transmit the telecommunication terminal status information to the telecommunication terminal;

Forlenza teaches the following limitations:

A method for providing telecommunication terminal status information to people having at least one of poor visual acuity and poor hearing, comprising the steps of: (Preamble portion reciting intended use not given weight as above)

-Displaying the emphasized visual telecommunication terminal status information on the visual display. (Forlenza teaches that the call status information and the like are shown on a separate display, such as in Figure 2C such that the user can still have a normal phone and have the separate device which provides said information – 5:20-50, or client 138 as in Figure 1, explained in 6:45-7:35)

Forlenza partially teaches the following limitations:

-Emphasizing the accessed telecommunication terminal status information from telecommunications terminal by the computer via the network; (Forlenza teaches that such call status information is shown to the user and can be maximized and minimized and the like - 9:10-35)

-Establishing communication with the telecommunication terminal via the network by a computer controlling a visual display separate from the telecommunication terminal; (Forlenza Figure 1, client 138, 6:44-50, e.g. a PC or the like, and digital phones (e.g. 104) are also known – 2:40-3:6, where this includes status information 3:50-4:40, such as binary codes and the like, 7:10-25 where the system may deliver status codes directly to the client via the Internet and the like)

-Directly accessing the telecommunication terminal status information from the

telecommunication switching system by the computer via a path distinct from that used to transmit the telecommunication terminal status information to the telecommunication terminal; (Forlenza Figure 1, telephones 108 attached to PBX 110 as an example, where this clearly provides digital information, and digital phones (e.g. 104) are also known – 2:40-3:6, where this includes status information 3:50-4:40, such as binary codes and the like, 7:10-25 where the system may deliver status codes directly to the client via the Internet and the like. Also, Figure 1 shows telephone 104, which clearly is attached to the public network, where this phone can receive some status information (e.g. receiving phone call, terminal state, dial tone, etc). Finally, Forlenza clearly shows that IP phones are contemplated, e.g. 1:40-65, 7:25-40)

Forlenza fails to expressly teach emphasizing, whereas Schnarel teaches:
-Emphasizing the accessed telecommunication terminal status information from telecommunications terminal by the computer via the network; (Schnarel clearly displays enhanced visual information for connected calls and status information – see Figure 1 as call slip 100 in extended form that sits on top of the display (5:10-20), and Figure 5, where such enhanced or enlarged text is discussed as shown as extended call slip 500 / 504 in Figure (5:65-6:10), where such information is enhanced during a call, as well as icons concerning the status and the like, 7:35-8:40 and the like, especially including 11:50-60 – this is the most relevant portion)

Forlenza fails to expressly teach connecting to the telecommunications terminal by the computer via the network, whereas Morgan teaches:

-Establishing communication with the telecommunication terminal via the network by a computer controlling a visual display separate from the telecommunication terminal; (Morgan teaches obtaining status information from device (Abstract, Title) printing system 17 to print clients (e.g. remote workstations 3:15-40) when there are messages generated by the printer concerning status or available resource, e.g. remote device connecting (computer) to telecommunications terminal)(Forlenza Figure 1 and 7:25-40 clearly suggest that the devices could be on the same IP network and the like)

Forlenza teaches some of the limitations of the instant application, but fails to teach that such visual information is emphasized. Schnarel clearly teaches that limitation, as described above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Forlenza to emphasize such information as per Schnarel 2:30-50.

Forlenza fails to expressly state the telecommunications terminal and computer are on the same network, though as stated above, this is strongly implied. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Forlenza to have such an arrangement because this would result in efficiencies of operation, where

a digital network allows bypassing of unnecessary status translation (Forlenza 7:25-40), and further this would be an easier implementation.

Finally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that since the central system of Forlenza directly provides status information to the devices from the external switches (12:52-13:7, 1:37-39, Abstract), it would be redundant to send such information to both the telecommunication terminal and the computer, especially since the devices are on the same local / wide area network and are accessible to each other, and are both in physical proximity to the same user in the scenario contemplated by Forlenza. Morgan provides an example of a local area system that obtains information and from to local client(s), as described above. It is clear that the status passing described above would be applicable to the digital VoIP telephone on the same network as the computer. It would therefore have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art to directly send the status messages to the local client, such that there would be no redundant data transmission over the network so that the computer could therefore display such information, especially given that IP phones may be nothing more than a simple handset with a TCP/IP address and thusly are not capable of properly displaying and/or interpreting such status information. Further, the embodiment of Forlenza in Figure 1 has a default preference to passing message to the client 138 in any case.

As to claim 13, and 27, Forlenza 6:40-65 teaches that the system utilizes the Internet and a TCP/IP protocol stack, where it is known in the art that TCP/IP utilizes sockets. For example, Schnarel cites several publications concerning smart phones and the like that utilize Java (for web phones, etc), which is well known to use the socket programming paradigm. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that both the concept and advantage of the use of sockets in TCP/IP systems is well known and expected in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use sockets for TCP/IP in order to make programming implementations easier and at a higher level of object orientation (see Java). (See AAPA as above, Response to Arguments)

As to claim 14 and 28, see above for claim 13, since that if the connection is made via an IP socket, obviously the data will be read through such a socketed connection. (See AAPA as above, Response to Arguments).

Claims 4-7, 9-12, 18-21, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over FSM as applied to claim 2/16 above, and further in view of Becker et al (US 6,192,341 B1).

As to claim 4 and 18, FSM do not expressly teach these limitations. Becker clearly teaches that it is beneficial to display information in a larger format to emphasize it and/or to render it visible to persons with visual impairments and the like (7:12-35),

where it would make sense to emphasize status information that is important, as already disclosed by Schnarel in the form of the expanded call slips, which is cited above and found in 4:50-60, 6:25-45, 11:50-60). However, Schnarel does not expressly address the situation of users with low visual acuity but emphasizes that showing alert information in a larger format, but does not expressly disclose using a larger font or the like. Becker teaches several methods of doing so and that such is beneficial for at least visually impaired users (7:12-35), so such a combination would have been obvious to a PHOSITA at the time the invention was made for those reasons.

As to claim 5 and 19, clearly the expanded call slip of Schnarel is a different form, but since it is unknown how applicant is defining the term, Becker clearly teaches showing such information in a "different visual form" such as by changing the contrast, color schema, etc (7:10-20). Motivation and rationale are taken from rejection of claim 4 above.

As to claim 6 and 20, Becker clearly discloses changing the contrast ratio, changing the font and the colors thereof, and Schnarel teaches having a large unique area of the display with the expanded call slip area and the like. Motivation and rationale are taken from rejection of claim 4 above.

As to claim 7 and 21, Becker generates such audio information in 7:35-55, and 3:35-55, and the like, as well as Forlenza 6:19-38. Motivation and rationale are taken from rejection of claim 4 above.

As to claim 9 and 23, Becker clearly teaches displaying such data in the larger font (7:12-35) and the like.

As to the claim 10 and 24, see claim 5 above.

As to claim 11 and 25, see claim 6 above.

As to claim 12 and 26, see claim 7 above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US PGPub 20050163316 (Wing).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Woods whose telephone number is 571-272-7775. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on 571-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Eric Woods

4/3/07



Ulka Chauhan
Supervisory Patent Examiner